

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING**  
**FEBRUARY 6, 1997**

PROJECTS REVIEWED

Holly Park  
Pipers Creek: Streets to Sound

Convened: 8:00 AM

CITY UPDATES

Urban Conservation  
Public Art Program

WORKING DISCUSSIONS

Convention Center Expansion  
1997 Design Commission Goals  
West Lake Union Workshop

Adjourned: 5:00 PM

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Barbara Swift, Chair  
Moe Batra  
Carolyn Darwish  
Gail Dubrow  
Robert Foley  
Gerald Hansmire  
Jon Layzer  
Rick Sundberg

STAFF PRESENT

Marcia Wagoner  
Vanessa Murdock  
Michael Read

020697.1      Project: **CONVENTION CENTER EXPANSION**  
Phase: Discussion  
Presenter: Mark Hinshaw, Urban Designer  
Attendees: Matt Lampe, Executive Services  
Chuck Hartung, Washington State Convention and Trade Center  
Chris Eseman, Loschky Marquardt & Nesholm  
Linda Willanger, Washington State Convention and Trade Center  
Marilyn Senour, Seattle Transportation Department  
Gerry Gerron, G2 Architecture  
Ted Caloger, G2 Architecture  
Time: 1 hour (N/C)

Mark Hinshaw, a member of the Urban Design team hired to advise the design team, briefed the Commission on preliminary Urban Design studies. In these studies the Convention Center site was analyzed in relationship to the downtown connections and corridors and the street envelope of 7th Avenue and Pike Street. In addition, the approaches and entries to the Center were studied, as were the existing plazas and open spaces associated with the Center and the opportunities for such places. The Urban Design team saw the covering of Pike Street as an opportunity to make a bold civic architectural gesture, but one that would have to be supported by careful attention to pedestrian and human scale elements along the street.

### **Discussion**

- Batra:** I am concerned about how the corner of 7th and Pike will be addressed. If that is to be your main entry, what do you plan to do about the loading bays of the Sheraton hotel across the street?
- Hinshaw:** I think the Sheraton will recognize the opportunity to put their best face forward onto a busy, public corner.
- Lampe:** There have been many discussions with the Sheraton regarding this matter. They realize that any expansion must address the corner of 7th and Pike and they have made that part of their program. The hotel is in private ownership and is thus less beholden to the City regarding exactly how they handle any expansion. However, should they need any discretionary approvals in the future, having comments on record pertaining to this corner would be helpful in stressing the importance of 7th and Pike.
- Swift:** This is a large project that will have significant impact on the public street experience. Are there some strong pieces from the urban design analysis, or guiding principles that have been carried forth into the design? Given your tight timeline, how do you plan to integrate the finer level details into the overall design process?
- Hinshaw:** One area of focus has been the corner of 7th Avenue and Pike Street. The treatment will require great finesse.

**Eseman:** The underlying principle for the design thus far has been a pedestrian orientation that requires us to break down the scale, provide a level of transparency, and facilitate pedestrian movement. Our intention is that the images from the urban design analysis will inspire the design. The building is large and the functional requirements of the building are crucial to the client. In the design process we are starting big and working towards the smaller details as we resolve the larger functional issues.

**Swift:** I was intrigued by your earlier approach of dividing into two teams to address the two different expansion alternatives. Have you considered taking the same approach in regards to the exterior and interior of the building?

**Hinshaw:** When we were exploring the alternatives, we were looking for prototypes. We did not find any. No one has ever enclosed a public space with a street going through the middle. The fact that this design is unprecedented makes it a fascinating, delicate problem.

**Swift:** You have as big of a problem/opportunity on the outside of the building as you do on the inside.

**Dubrow:** I am concerned about the fine grain detail. What will be the process that will ensure a rich street? What tools and mechanisms do you have in place to guide this public/private development?

**Hartung:** Our best tools are the two excellent firms we have hired; LMN and G2. The Convention Center is looking to the talent we have hired. Those firms are still grappling with the design alternatives as part of the design process.

**Dubrow:** Will there be design guidelines or standards in place to guide the development of the hotel.

**Hartung:** Not specifically, no.

**Dubrow:** I would urge you to translate the intentions of the hotel developer into guidelines that can inform future development.

**Foley:** I am grappling with the following question; can animation and street level activity compensate for the large scale of this project? Can the scale realistically be brought down? Early in the project you studied the building mass and modulation all along Pine. I feel, however, that this solution is not consistent with what you learned in this exercise. I would urge you to look at the spatial structure and development of this area. I think that a more open spatial feel in mid-block, where the potential "transportation space" may be developed, would be an important part of this investigation.

**Swift:** This project must be a comprehensive piece that is considered from up the street and from down the street. It is a very exciting problem, but a very challenging problem.

**Eseman:** Our early models and sketches do not show an integration of the walls and the arcade cover. We are now looking at the ground plane in relationship to the walls in relationship to the top. We will be relying on models as we continue to develop and refine the space.

**Batra:** Will a glass canopy one block long act as a wind tunnel? I wonder about the integrity of the structure.

**Layzer:** Regarding your goal of street level vitality, I am thinking about the European models you referenced and trying to draw comparisons between those cities and Seattle. Given the present level of activity on the street, I wonder about how you are going to make the space vital and active. I agree that this will be a much photographed structure, the challenge will be to make it engaging.

**Dubrow:** Some of the spaces you have mentioned as potential locations for art could really draw the majority of the art budget. You could end up with only one art piece for the whole project. I would encourage you to tie the art back to the street level at the pedestrian scale. What is your art budget?

**Hartung:** \$300,000.

**Hinshaw:** That can be leveraged by working closely with the architect.

**Dubrow:** As long as the timing is right.

**Swift:** There is continuity between the old Commission and the new in terms of concerns and support. We look forward to seeing the design solutions.

**ACTION:** The Design Commission appreciates the additional information presented and has the following recommendations and comments:

- ensure a parity of importance between the urban design streetscape and the interior circulation by retaining the urban design consultant team hired earlier in the design process or identifying another mechanism to assure sufficient design focus is placed on the public realm,
- define and outline the mechanisms in place to address the exterior,
- establish a process and set of standards to ensure that the excellent analytical work done thus far on the urban design aspects of the project be carried forward in the further development of the design,
- designate an entity to evaluate the level of compliance with standards and guidelines,
- ensure the standards applicable to the convention center also apply to the design and development of the hotel,
- provide a clear public benefit in exchange for the street vacation, and
- ensure the final product has the vitality of Picadilly Square and the elegance of the galleria in Milan, both cited as urban design examples in the urban design analysis.

020697.2

**URBAN CONSERVATION**

Discussion

Karen Gordon, Urban Conservation Division

Time: 1 hour (N/C)

Karen Gordon from the Urban Conservation Division briefed the Commission on historic preservation efforts in the City undertaken by her division and the role of historic preservation in the City. Seattle has seven landmark or special review districts; Pioneer Square, International Special Review District, Ballard Avenue Landmark District, Pike Place Market Historical District, Harvard-Belmont Landmark District, Fort Lawton Landmark District and Columbia City Landmark District, and over 200 individual landmarks of national and local significance. The possibility of joint review was discussed for projects that must appear before the Design Commission and the Landmarks Board. Housing projects were also discussed as the nature of the funding for those projects has thus far precluded earlier review. The Commission appreciated the opportunity to discuss historic preservation and the Landmarks Board with Ms. Gordon and look forward to a continued relationship with the Urban Conservation Division.

**The Commission will continue to communicate regularly with the Urban Conservation Division regarding opportunities for coordinated review of projects with joint interests or opportunities.**

020697.3

**1997 DESIGN COMMISSION GOALS**

Discussion

Time: 1 hour (N/C)

Commissioners and staff further refined the Goals and Initiatives for 1997.

020697.4

**WEST LAKE UNION WORKSHOP**

Working Discussion

Attendees: Pete Lagerwey, Seattle Transportation Department

Rich Smith, Seattle Public Utilities

Time: 1 hour (N/C)

Commissioners discussed the content and character of the report on the West Lake Union Corridor workshop. It was agreed that the report would document a point in time, that being the conclusion of the two day workshop. Team work, as well as the Design Commission recommendations will be presented, as will the common themes and competing desires that were identified in the workshop.

---

020697.5

**COMMISSION BUSINESS**

- A. MINUTES OF JANUARY 16, 1997 Approved as amended.
- B. CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS Commissioners agreed to schedule small meetings with City Council members to discuss the 1997 goals and initiatives.
- Batra Chow  
Darwish Nolan  
Dubrow Chong  
Podlodowski  
Foley Choe  
Podlodowski  
Hansmire Drago  
Pageler  
Layzer Doneldson  
McGiver  
Sundberg Choe  
McGiver
- C. PUBLIC PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT Commissioners discussed Public/Private Development in the City. Case studies of various partnerships will be reviewed by the Commission.
- D. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT Swift reported on her review of the Green Lake Park Boating Center Lakeside Erosion Control Change Order.

**ACTION: The Commission recommends approval of the design as presented and appreciates the effort made to incorporate Commission comments.**

---

020697.6

**PUBLIC ART PROGRAM**

Discussion

Barbara Goldstein, Seattle Arts Commission

Time: 1 hour (N/C)

Barbara Goldstein from the Seattle Arts Commission briefed the Design Commission on the Public Art Program. One percent of any construction project funded in part or completely by the City of Seattle must be allocated for public art. The 1996 Municipal Art Plan for the City contains 26 projects, 7 of which are new. The new projects include the Seattle Artist program for

City Light, the Pine Street project and planning for a 1997 Seattle Artist retrospective. The Commission greatly appreciated the opportunity to discuss the inclusion of public art in Capitol Improvement Projects with Ms. Goldstein and looks forward to a continued relationship with the Seattle Arts Commission.

**The Commission will work with Seattle Arts Commission staff on the topic of private/public development and its potential impacts on the public environment in the City.**

---

020697.7      Project: **HOLLY PARK**  
Phase: Update  
Presenters: Stephen Antupit, Office of Management and Planning  
Vince Lyons, Department of Construction and Land Use  
Ed Weinstein, Weinstein Copeland Architects  
David Rutherford, ARC Architects  
Melanie Davies, Swift and Company  
Henry Popkin, Popkin Development  
Time: 2 hour (N/C)

Holly Park is a Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) development originally built in 1942 as wartime worker housing. A little over 100 acres, located on the southeast flank of Beacon Hill west of Seward Park, the site is bisected by the City Light transmission right of way.

A redevelopment of Holly Park is underway, predicated on a mixed-use development. The goal is to dissipate the massive concentration of very low income families. The present 900 units on site will be replaced by 1200 units. The proportion of income levels, however will be quite different than that of today. Equal proportions of very low income, low to moderate income and market rate units will occupy the site.

The initial funding for the redevelopment of Holly Park came from a 1993 HUD program, Hope VI. Six cities in the country were selected as demonstration projects for Hope VI, with the goal of dismantling major housing projects and replacing them with mixed income units. Seattle, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, Los Angeles and Kansas City were the selected cities. Most of the housing projects targeted in the Hope VI project were vacant or mostly vacant. Holly Park is fully occupied and run by a functional housing authority, making it remarkably different from the housing projects in the other Hope VI cities. HUD's funds are to be supplemented by instruments such as private equity, tax credits and the like.

A combined design team of Weinstein Copeland Architects, ARC Architects, Swift and Company Landscape Architects, Nakano Dennis Landscape Architects, SvR Design and Parsons

Brinkenhoff have been hired for the project. The firm of Weinstein Copeland has taken the lead on developing a master plan for the site. Three other architecture firms will work on prototype development. Designs will then be turned back to Weinstein Copeland to take the design through Construction Documents. The first of three phases has been planned, on the section of the site referred to as Upper Holly. The work planned includes reintroducing a grid pattern to the street network which is now characterized by cul de sacs. A combination of duplexes, townhouses and single family houses will constitute the housing with no structure accommodating more than 4 units. The layout and style of the structures will be akin to bungalows with parking to the side of the house or off the alley. All housing will have a private rear yard. Because different architects will be designing the prototypes, there will be a diversity of styles within a common theme.

The main road into Holly Park, 32nd Ave South, will be realigned to a location further west. A Community Center and building housing some South Seattle Community College functions will be built to the northeast of the intersection of 32nd S and Myrtle, creating a campus of learners. An education center and family center will be housed in the community center building, while the education building will have mostly classrooms, a library, facilities for tutoring and space for the Private Industry Council.

The project has made vast progress in the past six months. In July of 1996, the joint Design Review Board and Seattle Design Commission process began with former Design Commission Chair Dennis Haskell acting as chair of the joint review panel. Cost estimates and financing projections were completed in August of 1996, and in December the MUP application was submitted and the EIS published. Relocation of some residents began in January of this year. Phase I demolition and construction is scheduled to begin this summer.

*(please refer to the Seattle Design Commission minutes of January 18, 1996 for further information)*

### **Discussion**

- Batra:** Why is 32nd S being realigned?
- Weinstein:** All alignments of this road are flawed. From a standpoint of traffic and land use this location is the best of the flawed alternatives.
- Dubrow:** Your work represents a significant effort. I have a few concerns regarding the transitional spaces, which are few in your design. I wonder if the opportunities for smaller, cooperative places are precluded.
- Weinstein:** Most Seattle neighborhoods have yards that are private. People aspire to having a private yard. Once you start mixing up the yards, it becomes very difficult to determine who will get the private yards and who will not.
- Antupit:** The grid will have to respond to the significant trees as we will be saving those trees. That in itself will shift the grid and make it less uniform. There will be transitions between the bordering single family neighborhood and Holly park.
- Weinstein:** Many anomalous conditions will result from us fitting the grid to the topography and saving the significant trees.



- Popkin:** We have discussed opportunities for the 200 foot wide power line easement such as shared terraced gardens. That area will be a transitional area.
- Weinstein:** The power line right-of-way will be sculpted, terraced and landscaped with non-edible items such as flowers.
- Antupit:** Opportunities for cooperative gardens and a farmers market have been provided through the design in the lower portion of Holly Park.
- Dubrow:** Troy West and Jackie Levitt had some wonderful solutions to shared open space that appeared at the New American Home competition in Minneapolis. You might want to look at some of their work.
- Sundberg:** Can you explain how the other architects will participate in this process?
- Weinstein:** We need a certain level of standardization given our very tight budget and the number of competing interests. We want to establish a standard set of principles for the architects so that the excavation can be standard. The architects will interpret the standards differently which will hopefully result in a variety of design with common themes. The designs will come back through Weinstein Copeland for us to critique and eventually place on the site. Many Seattle homes were built off the shelf which allowed for a certain degree of mix and match design. Right now we are working on a delivery system, the details of which we will shake out in phase 1.
- Sundberg:** I think your planning principles are solid and I would hope that other architects follow through on them. The floor plans are good and maximize the square footage.
- Darwish:** What kind of lighting are you providing?
- Weinstein:** There will be standard lighting on all of the streets. Because the porches are closer to the street, they will be casting additional light onto the streets and sidewalk.
- Hansmire:** Are you able to do carriage houses because of the zone?
- Weinstein:** Yes.
- Dubrow:** Will you be building in the infrastructure for water to the garages and car ports to allow for mother-in-law dwellings?
- Weinstein:** We started out wanting garages for every dwelling, but that would mean foregoing the community center. We won't be running water out to the garages and car ports. If we were to build in the infrastructure for possible dwelling, we would have to include a sewer as well which would escalate the cost.
- Antupit:** Art has not yet been incorporated, although there have been art-related components in the design process.
- Rutherford:** To that end, the Seattle Arts Commission is looking to identify an artist planner for the project.
- Foley:** Could you explain your rationale for the location of the community center?
- Weinstein:** We looked for a geographic location that was equivalent for all three subareas of Holly Park. The library and other services wanted visibility from the street.
- Sundberg:** As you continue in schematics, I would recommend looking again at the entry to the campus of learners. In addition, using the vault shape on both building roofs might diminish the importance of the library.

**Rutherford:** It helps us get under the height requirement.

**Dubrow:** What features have you identified that you feel create a strong entry?

**Rutherford:** We have not gotten to that point yet.

**Hansmire:** Are you talking about the entry to the buildings or to the site?

**Dubrow:** The entry to the complex of buildings.

**Davies:** The entry will narrow and then open up into the open space of the campus.

**Dubrow:** That is not yet apparent in plan.

**Foley:** I like the attempt to draw activities outside, however ideally, outdoor activities would not be up against a busy road.

**Weinstein:** We will use the slope to our best advantage.

**ACTION:** The Commission greatly appreciates the thorough and thoughtful presentation and offers the following comments:

- the Commission supports the planned mix of income levels and believes this mix is essential to the vitality of the community,
- the Commission supports the planning effort, especially the mechanism in place allowing the participation of other architects in the interpretation of the master plan so as to provide diversity in the project,
- the Commission supports the layout of the streets that has allowed a connection to the surrounding community while respecting the topography and existing significant vegetation on the site.

The Commission recognizes that all aspects of the project are not at the same level of design development and looks forward to seeing the Campus of Learners and Family Center components, as well as the plan for shared and communal open spaces on the site at the time those pieces are at the same level of refinement as the planning effort.

---

020697.8      Project: **PIPERS CREEK: STREETS TO SOUND**  
Phase: Concept  
Presenters: Catlin Evans, consultant  
              Heidi Meyer, graphic designer  
Time: 1 hour (N/C)

Interpretive signs are proposed to be placed in the Pipers Creek watershed, starting at Greenwood and 85th following the creek to the Carkeek Park trail head. The concept for the signs has been developed in conjunction with a number of middle school students who conducted a door-to-door survey in the neighborhood on the topic of storm water. Two kinds of signs are proposed; street signs and pedestrian scale signs that will have more information. Information to be included on the pedestrian scale signs are a detailed map of the Pipers creek tributaries and planting tips for

bog and wet areas. The students are working with the consultants on the design and wording of the signs. The project hopes to have signs in place by Earth Day.

### **Discussion**

**Dubrow:** I would suggest talking to the students about the visual representation of ideas and the visual impact of signage. Perhaps using standard city street signs will not be the best vehicle to convey your message. This project would be an opportunity to tap into the resources of the Seattle Arts Commission.

**Evans:** Only 5 of the 12 signs will be of the street sign type.

**Goldstein:** Have you been working with the Drainage and Wastewater utility?

**Evans:** Yes, in our research phase.

**Goldstein:** Have you considered stencil signs?

**Evans:** Yes, we will be doing that in May.

**Dubrow:** Regarding the student's choice of salmon as an image, I would ask the students to look at how many artists have seized on that same image.

What continuity or progression do you have along the trail? I think educating people is a goal, but so is encouraging good behavior. In addition to noting what not to do, you might want to include what to do.

What lessons did you learn from the Pipers Creek bus shelter?

**Evans:** The amazing thing about that shelter is that it is still in great shape. People have really taken care of it. I think we could have included more practical information.

**Swift:** Regarding the image of the salmon, I agree that it is often used. However, it really is an icon for this region.

**Darwish:** I would ask the kids to focus on what is underneath the ground surface and what steps can be taken to keep it clean.

**ACTION:** **The Commission recommends approval of the project and strongly endorses the concept. The Commission requests that the consultant forward on the specific location of the signs.**